



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

|                        |   |                               |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| RONNIE LEE CASH        | § |                               |
| Petitioner,            | § |                               |
|                        | § |                               |
| vs.                    | § | CIVIL ACTION NO. 0:16-716-MGL |
|                        | § |                               |
| WARDEN JOSEPH MCFADDEN | § |                               |
| Respondent.            | § |                               |

---

---

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,  
GRANTING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT,  
AND DISMISSING PETITIONER'S PETITION AS UNTIMELY

---

---

This case was filed as a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 action. Petitioner is proceeding pro se. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that Respondent's motion for summary judgment be granted and Petitioner's Petition be dismissed as untimely. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on September 13, 2016, but Petitioner failed to file any objections to the Report. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that Respondent’s motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** and Petitioner’s Petition is **DISMISSED** as untimely.

To the extent that Petitioner requests a certificate of appealability from this Court, that certificate is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 5th day of October, 2016, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
 MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within 30 days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.